



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/196,680	11/20/1998	STEPHEN J. MEYER	5903-157	9428

570 7590 11/29/2001

AKIN, GUMP, STRAUSS, HAUER & FELD, L.L.P.  
ONE COMMERCE SQUARE  
2005 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2200  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

KIM, CHRISTOPHER S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3752

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/196,680

Applicant(s)  
Meyer et al.

Examiner  
Christopher S. Kim

Art Unit  
3752



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 Aug 2001
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 20-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 20-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 19
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 3752

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Request for Continued Examination***

1. The request for continued examination filed on August 29, 2001 for Application No. 09/196,680 is acceptable and an RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. Preliminary amendment filed August 29, 2001 is acknowledged.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

4. The information disclosure statement filed August 29, 2001 is acknowledged.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. Claims 1-16 and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fischer in view of Tramm.

With respect to claims 1-3, 7, 8, 9, 13 and 20-23, Fischer discloses a sprinkler comprising: a generally tubular body 30 having a central passageway 31, a closure 40, a trigger 44, and a deflector 38. Fischer teaches the use of a deflector 38 shaped and positioned to transform a

Art Unit: 3752

horizontal flow of water into a spray pattern of droplets dispersed over a generally horizontal, rectangularly-shaped coverage area (see figures 1 and 6). The coverage area may be up to 16 ft x 24 ft (see column 3 lines 55-58). Tramm discloses, in column 5, lines 12-14, a horizontal-type fire protection sprinkler having a K-factor of at least 3.5, or at least 5.0, or at least 7.0, or at least 10.5, or at least 13.0. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the sprinkler of Fischer with the range of K-factors (greater than 9) as taught by Tramm to provide a specific flow rate depending on pressure.

With respect to claim 21, the device of Fischer in view of Tramm discloses the claimed limitation with the exception of the water flow rate and coverage area being at a height of only three feet below the canopy portion of the deflector. Fischer in view of Tramm discloses the structural limitations, K-factors including the relationship between flow rates and pressures, and the coverage area. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have positioned the sprinkler of Fischer in view of Tramm three feet above the coverage area to extinguish fires in three feet high compartments.

With respect to claim 4, Fischer discloses the limitations of the claimed invention with the exception of the liquid filled glass bulb. Tramm discloses, pictorially, in figure 2, a liquid filled glass bulb 20. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have replaced the trigger of Fischer with the trigger (liquid filled glass bulb) of Tramm to eliminate the need for solder.

Art Unit: 3752

With respect to claims 5, 6, 10-12, and 14-16, Fischer discloses, in column 3, lines 55-58, a coverage area of 16 ft x 24 ft (using a deflector comprising a generally planar face portion and a canopy portion, see figure 2). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the coverage area is dependent on the fluid pressure, and therefore, any coverage area less than 16 ft x 24 ft can be attained by reducing the pressure (or increasing the K-factor which results in a lower pressure as defined by the formula in column 5, lines 30-38 of Tramm). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have adjusted the coverage area depending on the size of the room, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed July 11, 2001 and August 29, 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is noted that although applicant states that claim 20 is broader than originally filed claims because it does not require a quick response thermal element, claim 20 recites "a thermally responsive trigger" in line 4.

Art Unit: 3752

In response to applicant's argument that Tramm does not teach or suggest that his 5.6K factor sprinkler would work acceptably if modified in orifice size, Tramm teaches the relationship between K factor, flow rate and pressure and their application to horizontal type sprinklers.

In response to applicant's argument that Tramm refers other to the listing organizations for an identification of other sidewall sprinklers to which the concept of his invention may be applied and does not purport to provide an enabling disclosure, the examiner maintains that Tramm teaches applicant's claimed K-factor and the application to sidewall mounted sprinklers. Tramm's reference to listing organizations is for the use of his teachings.

In response to applicant's supplemental declaration of James E. Golinveaux under 37 CFR 1.132 that Fischer nor Tramm ever built any sidewall sprinkler having a K factor greater than 9, applicant's claims are rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103.

In response to applicant's argument regarding performance tests, such requirements do not appear to be claimed limitations.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Tramm discloses that flow rate is directly dependent on K factor and

Art Unit: 3752

inversely dependent on the square root of the pressure. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have varied the parameters to achieve a specific flow rate dependent on application criteria.

In response to applicant's argument that the prior art does not teach an extended coverage ordinary hazard fire protection with a sidewall sprinkler, the preamble of claim 1 recites "[a]n extended coverage sidewall automatic fire sprinkler". The phrase "extended coverage" has been given patentable weight to the extent that it provides a name for the device. The limitations within the body of the claim have been considered to identify the device. Therefore, since the limitations within the body of the claim are disclosed by Fischer in view of Tramm, that device too must be considered an extended coverage sidewall automatic fire sprinkler.

In response to applicant's argument that the ability to provide extended coverage ordinary hazard protection with a sidewall sprinkler is a property that has not been shown to be possessed by the prior art, Fischer in view of Tramm provides for such an ability.

### *Conclusion*

7. This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 09/196,680. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in

Art Unit: 3752

this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher S. Kim whose telephone number is (703) 308-8336. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7766.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.

CK

November 14, 2001



David A. Scherbel  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3700